

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/822,820	04/02/2001	Said El Fassi	P07156US00/RFH	8066
881	7590 11/17/2005		EXAMINER	
STITES & HARBISON PLLC			ZIA, SYED	
1199 NORTI SUITE 900	H FAIRFAX STREET		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 2131	
	RIA, VA 22314			
			DATE MAILED: 11/17/200	•

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/822,820	EL FASSI ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
Syed Zia	2131

	Syeu Zia	2131	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 29 September 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of ving replies: (1) an amendment, aftice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	Appeal. To avoid aba fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	ice, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejecti	on.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date	06.07(f).		
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Offi	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	
AMENDMENTS			
3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belowed)	nsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	• •	ducing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)			(· · · · /·
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: -None Claim(s) objected to: -None		II be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-9</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: -None			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fai	Is to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Attachment.</u></li> </ol>	t does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowar	nce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)	

## Attachment to Advisory Action

This office action is in response to after-final amendment filed on September 29, 2005.

Applicant's request for consideration has been fully considered but they are not persuasive because of the following reasons:

Applicant amended independent claims. These amendments require further consideration because either scope of the claims has been changed when interpreting existing claim limitation in conjunction with amended limitation, or amendment does not place the application in condition for allowance, some examples are:

Claim 1 line 3) "each suitable for... so as to provide input data codes..."

Claim 1, line 11) "...controlling the processor; said verifying being at least partly based on said input data codes and the code computed by the peripheral for each elementary operation performed by the processor, while the processor... functional values of the encoded data".

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on September 29, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because of the following reasons:

Regarding Claims 1-9 applicants argued that the cited prior art (CPA) [Veil et al. U. S. Patent No. 6,092,202] that, "the security co-processor of cited prior art does not compute codes within the meaning of that word as claimed in the claims but rather merely encrypts sensitive

Application/Control Number: 09/822,820

Art Unit: 2131

1

data," and also argued that "the security co-processor of the cited prior art is not concerned with error detection with respect to system behavior, and, does not receive at least the input data codes, the operands, and the nature of the operation for each elementary operation performed by the main processor," and cited prior art does not "compute a code for each elementary operation performed by the processor, or verify proper operation of all or part of the executed program."

Applicant also argued that the cited prior art does not teach, "wherein the security co-processor and the computer process different data".

This is not found persuasive. Cited prior art clearly teaches system and method for where an interface interfaces a security coprocessor to a host computer. The interface includes the communication protocol for restricting access by the host computer to the data transmitted through the coprocessor. Secure transaction processing is performed locally in the security coprocessor and non-secure transaction processing is performed in the host computer. In the system of cited prior art the data transmitted through the security coprocessor includes sensitive data such as personal and personal identification data. The interface communication protocol is implemented in application programming interface. A trusted input device such as keyboard and keypad is connected to the coprocessor. The input device includes a secure mode indicator for indicating secure mode in response to requests from host computer for keyboard entries of sensitive data. Thus, in the system of cited prior art the transactions are protected from unauthorized intrusion. Smart card require built-in function only for storing sensitive data including account number and private key. Smart cards carry biometric data for reliable proof of participation and cardholder verification (col.7 line 28 to col.11 line 44).

Application/Control Number: 09/822,820

Art Unit: 2131

ţ

As a result, the system of cited prior art provides a system and method for a secure computer system as broadly claimed in system.

Applicants <u>still</u> have failed to explicitly identify specific claim limitations, which would define a patentable distinction over prior arts.

The examiner is not trying to teach the invention but is merely trying to interpret the claim language in its broadest and reasonable meaning. The examiner will not interpret to read narrowly the claim language to read exactly from the specification, but will interpret the claim language in the broadest reasonable interpretation in view of the specification. Therefore, the examiner asserts that cited prior art does teach or suggest the subject matter broadly recited in independent and dependent claims. Accordingly, rejections for Claims 1-9 are respectfully maintained.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Syed Zia whose telephone number is 571-272-3798. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 09/822,820

Art Unit: 2131

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Page 5

 $\mathbf{SZ}$ 

November 05, 2005